

within Los Angeles County, contain no trees. Therefore, the reasonably foreseeable development and removal of trees would not conflict with local ordinances and no impacts would result from the proposed project.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

If all project sites were developed, the development would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The sites are not contained within any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved Habitat Plan Area, thus no impact would result to such plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY

The initial review suggests that there is no potentially significant cultural resources impact that could not be mitigated by standard mitigation measures. These impacts and the appropriate mitigation measures will be considered in the EIR.

IMPACTS ANALYSIS

SALE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAYA DEL REY AND MARINA DEL REY LOTS

Please see Appendix D for a discussion of the cultural resources in the project area.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Development of the MDR and PDR lots would not have a substantial adverse effect on the significance of a historical resource. Although historic resources are located within a one-mile radius of the proposed project, no historic resources are located on the properties. There are no California Historical Landmarks or California Points of Historical Interest listed within a one-mile radius of the overall project area. The project would not impact a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Development of the PDR lots would require mitigation so as to not have a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or disturb any human remains. Twenty-eight archaeological sites have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the project area. Of these, 23 are prehistoric archaeological sites and five are historic archaeological sites. Five of the prehistoric sites are located within the boundaries of Playa del Rey, between Gulana Avenue on the west and Hastings Avenue on the east. None of the five archaeological sites occur within known boundaries of the PDR parcels included in this project. Because none of the five documented archaeological sites occur within the PDR parcels, the proposed project would not pose an adverse impact on known cultural resources. There is, however, a high overall density of prehistoric sites recorded along the bluff south of Ballona Creek between the beach and Interstate 405 (approximately 20). Many of these sites were discovered prior to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and did not result from systematic pedestrian survey. This means that a relatively high potential for undocumented buried prehistoric cultural material still exists along the bluff. This potentially significant impact would be considered less than significant once appropriate mitigations are developed implemented in the EIR.

Development of the MDR lots would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or disturb any human remains. No archaeological sites have been recorded within the Marina del Rey / Venice portion of the project area. Prehistoric archaeological sites are not expected within the former Ballona Lagoon and wetlands, which were dredged and filled in 1965 to form the marina.

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Development of the PDR lots would require mitigation so as to not destroy any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. The Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology indicates that no fossils have ever been reported as occurring in dune sand within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Venice 7.5 Quad. The lack of previously recorded fossil sites suggests a low potential for fossils within the project area in areas underlain by dune sand. However, as described in Appendix D, several previously recorded fossil sites occur in the Palos Verdes Sand. These occurrences indicate a high potential for fossil remains in the northern portion of the project area, which is underlain by Palos Verdes Sand. This potentially significant impact would be considered less than significant once appropriate mitigations are developed implemented in the EIR.

Development of the MDR lots would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Little or no potential for fossil remains is indicated by the geological character of the Marina del Rey / Venice portion of the project area, which is comprised of dune sand and fill materials dredged from Ballona Lagoon during construction of the marina.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

See comments on item b) above.

VI. ENERGY

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
VI. ENERGY—Would the project:					
a)	Result in a substantial increase in overall or per capita energy consumption?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Increase reliance on natural gas and oil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Require or result in the construction of new sources of energy supplies or additional energy infrastructure capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Comply with adopted energy efficiency standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>